DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 718 HE 007 885

AUTHOR Peterson, Nancy A.
TITLE Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education: What Is Faculty Role?
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Center for Educational Development.
PUB DATE Dec 72
NOTE 9p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Educational Development, 317 Walter Library, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
JOURNAL CIT Comment; n10 p1-8 Nov-Dec 1972

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Conference Reports; Conferences; Cooperative Planning; *Decision Making; Educational Administration; Educational Coordination; *Higher Education; *Policy Formation; *Statewide Planning; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Minnesota

ABSTRACT

The role to be played by higher education faculties in statewide decision making was addressed at the 1972 Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conference. Conference speakers both pointed up a paucity of existing proposals for significant faculty participation and suggested that responsibility for development of such proposals lies with faculties themselves. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

comment

ED122718

Statewide coordination of postsecondary education: What is faculty role?

A report of the 1972 Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conference

In many areas of the nation, planning for higher education is moving increasingly away from the campus and into the statewide decision-making arena. Coordinating agencies, with varying degrees of budget and program responsibilities, determine what kinds of institutions shall exist and where, approve or reject academic programs, set tuition policy, and in other ways determine the shape of things to come. What role are faculties to play in all of this? That question was the subject of a recent conference of faculty members from Minnesota institutions, reported in this issue of Comment. *Conference speakers both pointed up a paucity of existing proposals for significant faculty participation and suggested that responsibility for development of such proposals lies with faculties themselves.*

When needs are great and dollars tight, as in the case of postsecondary education in Minnesota and elsewhere, decisions made in the allocation of resources take on the character of life-or-death judgments for the programs involved. With Minnesota's postsecondary systems and institutions competing for a shrinking proportion of resources, the state's efforts to make the best use of available resources to meet educational needs have necessarily and increasingly become a process of coordinating the offerings of these systems and institutions.

The agency chiefly responsible for statewide coordination of postsecondary education is the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC), established for that purpose by the state legislature some seven years ago. Input into the coordination process comes formally and informally from a variety of sources, including postsecondary institution and system administrators, state legislators, students, and the public. Despite the obvious impact of coordination on faculties and the institutions within which they work, however, faculty members themselves have taken little part in the decision making process.

Aware of the growing importance of statewide coordination and the limited extent of faculty participation to date, the Planning Committee of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conference selected "The Role of the Faculty in Statewide Coordination of Postsecondary Education" as the theme for its sixth annual conference, held Sept. 29 - Oct. 1 at Breezy Point Resort near Brainerd, Minn.

Some 120 representatives of 44 institutions, including public and private colleges, junior colleges, the University of Minnesota (all campuses), and several educational governing bodies, took part in the conference, established to bring together faculty

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 00 7 845

COMMENT is the periodic publication of the University of Minnesota Center for Educational Development. James Werntz, Director. Gordon Wm. Kingston, Assistant Director. Andrew Ahlgren, Associate Director for Precollege Development. Nancy Peterson, Writer-Editor.

from across the state to discuss areas of major concern to higher education as well as to foster and support more intercollegiate contact and communication.

Speakers addressed the coordination theme from a number of viewpoints. Richard Hawk, executive director of the HECC, described the thrust of that agency's efforts. Harold Lieberman, professor of social science at St. Cloud State College, spoke from the faculty perspective, and Duane Scribner, special assistant to the governor for program development, from that of a faculty member now in government. Putting postsecondary coordination into the context of other state coordination efforts was a panel consisting of Dean Honetschlager, staff member of the Minnesota State Planning Agency; Carl Kroening, member of the HECC, and Eugene Mammenga, state senator and faculty member at Bemidji State College.

'Faculty role can be what you make it'

Richard Hawk keynoted the conference by telling assembled faculty representatives, "The role of faculty in coordination of postsecondary education can be as large and as productive as the faculty (a) wish it to be, (b) are willing to back up with productive efforts, and (c) are willing to assume responsibility for." While the HECC has no formal channel for input by faculty *per se* (a fact that figured prominently in later discussions), Hawk pointed out that individual faculty members do serve on HECC advisory committees, and called for even more such participation. He also described the functions of the HECC and suggested some steps faculty might take to involve themselves in statewide postsecondary coordination.

The HECC was created by the Minnesota legislature in 1965 to study postsecondary education in the state, assess needs, and develop plans and programs to meet the needs. One of its major responsibilities is the review of proposed and existing programs of postsecondary institutions in the state. Program review is accomplished through the Curriculum Advisory Committee, composed of three representatives from each of the four publicly supported systems and from the private colleges. All proposals for new programs or major revisions in existing programs are reviewed by the Curriculum Advisory Committee and a recommendation to the HECC developed on the basis of need for the program, its cost-effectiveness, and its consistency with the mission of the proposing system. In program review as in other areas, the HECC has no direct authority; its recommendations are merely advisory. This concept Hawk described as "voluntary coordination through planning rather than control."

The commission's charge is to coordinate the efforts of the state's educational systems — vocational-technical institutes, junior colleges, state colleges, University of Minnesota, and private colleges (largely represented by the Private College Council) — and the institutions that make up those systems, rather than the people within the systems and institutions, Hawk said. But, he admitted, the commission has some difficulty in knowing who speaks, or should speak, for a system, or for an institution within a system.

With these questions unanswered, Hawk said, the commission finds it difficult to determine what should be the role of the faculty in the decision-making process. However, he suggested a number of ways in which interested faculty might contribute to statewide postsecondary coordination:

- *"Serve on one of the HECC advisory committees."* The HECC has a number of committees dealing with particular areas of concern, such as computer use, community service and continuing education, and interinstitutional instructional television, as well as development of state policy in such areas as financial planning. Faculty members serve on each, along with administrators. "There is room for a lot more people on these committees," he said, adding that such service will continue to be helpful if undertaken in the spirit of applying one's expertise to the problem at hand rather than representing the viewpoint of a particular institution or system.
- *"Ask some questions as you consider developments at the institutional level."* For example: "How does this proposal fit into the pattern of postsecondary education in this state?" Or: "Is this proposal consistent with some overall conception of what postsecondary education ought to be doing, and some rational recognition of the differentiated contributions which various institutions are going to perform in meeting the needs?" Or: "Will our moving in this particular direction represent appropriate economy of effort in terms of what other institutions in the state are proposing?"

"If you did no more than ask those questions as you go about planning at the institutional level, you would make a remarkable contribution to coordination of statewide postsecondary education," Hawk said.

- *"Help bring the rest of us back to an institutional orientation."* Hawk said there is a tendency to think of the educational *systems* as if they deliver the services of education, when actually the *institutions* do so. "People talk about the mission, function, or role of the system, when in fact the institutions within each system are very

different from one another. When we think in terms only of systems or types of institutions, we commit, in my judgment, a gross error . . . . You ought to be telling us that students are educated in institutions, and in classroom situations which involve a faculty member and a student."

- *"Develop some ways for faculties to make decisions more rapidly at the institutional level."* He said attempts to submit issues under consideration by the HECC for deliberation at the institutional level have been met in some quarters with a request for additional time for faculty consideration because of summer leaves and busy fall schedules, despite the fact that a recommendation had to be made in time to meet a legislative session deadline. On the other hand, Hawk said, faculties exhibit impatience when awaiting HECC decisions.
- *"Propose that the faculty of your institution really ought to know what is going on in terms of statewide planning and policy for postsecondary education."* Hawk suggested sending a faculty representative to attend HECC meetings, or, as a less satisfactory alternative, reading the minutes of HECC meetings. As a further step, he continued, faculties could arrange to have their representatives report back about the kinds of issues under consideration, and could discuss "whether you as a faculty ought to make some input into these issues."
- *"Begin to be an active rather than a passive observer of what's happening in the formal structure of coordination of postsecondary education at the state level."* It is interesting, he said, to note the kinds of people who appear before the commission with something to say: representatives of the various state educational systems, students, special interest groups such as representatives of a community which wants a postsecondary institution established locally. Rarely, he said, does a "just plain faculty member" come forth to say something he thinks might assist the commission in addressing the problems of postsecondary education.

"We know there is tremendous talent among faculty of institutions of this state," Hawk said. "If somehow we could direct just a small part of the attention of this talent to some of the problems with which we have to deal, we could make not only more rapid but more effective progress in seeing that state policies are such that the real purposes of postsecondary education are facilitated, and that your job in delivering the services of postsecondary education is made easier and better."

In response to a question from the audience, Hawk said increased authority to enforce its recommendations would not necessarily add to the HECC's effectiveness. "You can't *make* people do too many things; it is better to stimulate them to do things," he explained. in the long run, he said, the most effective approach to coordination is to give the people who are responsible for delivering a service the opportunity and responsibility for making decisions regarding the delivery of the service. However, he said, it is questionable whether the participants in the delivery process can accept the kind of responsibility necessary for making certain decisions.

"It is difficult for people who are active participants, and therefore have a genuine interest in something, to take an objective view," he said. "People in the academic world can study almost anything objectively except higher education."

To a large extent, he continued, "Whether voluntary coordination works depends on the people in the institutions to be coordinated. If they recognize the desirability of a coordinated effort, and support some steps which may not always be in their own self-interest, I think this will work very effectively."

But Hawk emphasized that decision-making in the interests of statewide coordination may involve some real self-sacrifice. As an example, he said, "In the interests of voluntary coordination through planning, institutions may have to decide to share information about how much money they are planning to spend and for what purposes. This can be threatening, but it is probably on issues like that that we will determine whether voluntary coordination can be effective." This example is of particular significance because one of the HECC's chief handicaps is lack of access to budget information, a major indicator of institutional plans.

Questioned by a member of the audience about the commission's program review process, Hawk said the commission receives program proposals from all postsecondary systems in the state and approves the vast majority. However, he said, it is not a "rubber stamp" procedure. First, the fact that institutions now have to submit programs through the review procedure means they are being stimulated to think more seriously about questions of need, long range costs, duplication, and consistency of proposed programs with the mission of that particular institution. "It is my own bias that if we can stimulate institutions to pay effective attention to these issues, we've done our job better than we could possibly do it by seeking to make these kinds of judgments ourselves," he said. In addition, some proposals are returned for further thinking at an early stage and are either reworked or withdrawn. Finally, Hawk said, "I suspect, but can't prove, that without the existence of program review, some programs that we never had the opportunity to turn down would have been established. The very fact that such programs need to be

reviewed, I think, has some impact on institutional behavior."

He said the process also helps to alert all institutions in the state to "the kinds of developments occurring in their sister and brother institutions."

While the HECC has put its initial efforts into review of new programs, its charge also includes review of existing programs. Such a move will probably result in faculty members feeling "threatened," Hawk said, but he added, "We have taken some steps to encourage institutions to accept some responsibility to review existing programs and make some decisions with respect to elimination of programs. As we gain experience in program review, we'll probably have some more specific recommendations to make."

'Involvement requires formal structures'

Speaking as a representative of the faculty point of view, Harold Lieberman called on faculty members to recognize that it is in their own interests to get involved in statewide coordination and suggested that faculty participation should take place through a formalized structure.

"All kinds of decisions will be made in the future which will influence institutions and their faculties for better or for worse," he said. "It is not that administrators are grasping for power, but simply that decisions must be made and someone must make them. Either the faculty will be in on the decision-making or it will not."

The unmistakable trend toward greater statewide postsecondary coordination carries with it both dangers and opportunities, he said. "The question is what role must faculty play in minimizing the costs and maximizing the benefits of coordination? It hardly seems necessary to argue that they must involve themselves in coordination at the highest level. If the locus of decision-making in some areas shifts to a larger stage than the local one, then the faculty must make a similar and commensurate shift."

In the past, he said, little attention has been paid to formalizing and rationalizing the role of faculty; statewide coordination has traditionally been seen as coordination of institutions, with the chief administrators serving as spokesmen. Faculty interinstitutional involvement has been limited to highly specific cooperative ventures, he added.

A complicating factor acting against faculty involvement in statewide coordination, Lieberman suggested, is the divergence in the roles of faculty among different kinds of institutions, as well as differences in the institutions themselves. The different experiences at the local level color the individual's view of the faculty role and create a difficulty in reaching a meeting of minds when it comes to coordination, he pointed out.

Another problem is the question of who makes policy—faculty or administrators? While faculty finds itself both in the role of employee and that of professional deliverer of services, Lieberman argued that in its professional role faculty has both the right and the duty to exercise influence in educational affairs. Quoting Bertram Davis, AAUP general secretary, he said, "'The faculty is in a position to raise a variety of questions which merit consideration before a decision is reached and which nobody else may raise,' both locally and in interinstitutional efforts."

Formal structures are necessary for effective faculty participation in coordination, Lieberman said. "At the very least, the faculty role should be built into the structure in some fashion so it is more or less regularized. One way to do this is for faculty members to serve on the coordinating body itself. Another is to erect a parallel structure to monitor and provide input into the activities of such a coordinating body. The particular form is of less concern than the existence of the structure itself.

"The importance of regular faculty access to and information from coordinating agencies as well as systems and institutions can hardly be exaggerated. If the faculty doesn't know what is going on, it is unlikely and unable to exercise influence. Similarly, if administrators of agencies, systems and institutions don't know where they are going, any road will take them there, as Alice found out in Wonderland."

If postsecondary coordination is to be viewed as a system, Lieberman said, certain problems must be faced.

First, he said, "We shall have to find ways to generate some faculty loyalty to the larger systems of coordination, and this is no mean task, given the fact that at many institutions the greatest measure of loyalty still seems to be felt at the departmental level."

Another problem, he said, is that there is a need for at least some faculty members to become "political specialists"—to devote time and develop expertise to deal effectively with the issues which arise. He spoke of the strains encountered in institutions where first efforts at joint faculty-administration decision-making have produced friction and hostility. A recurring problem in such efforts, he said, is overcoming resistance by administrators as well as reticence of faculty members not accustomed to participating in the decision-making process. He suggested the same problem can be expected to be encountered if and when

faculty become involved at the interinstitutional level.

Even now, he continued, faculties complain justifiably over the time spent in committee meetings, and they undoubtedly do not look forward to yet another level of participation and organization. "However," Lieberman said, "I see no alternative.

"I am aware that faculties are notorious for moving slowly. As someone once said, 'Changing a curriculum is like moving a cemetery. . . .The dead have so many friends.' But I think we have to move. As Professor Marvin Bressler of Princeton has said, 'We must help to identify, elaborate, and clarify critical issues which require decisions, and we must help to create procedures for debating, adopting, and implementing proposals for educational change. If we do not, others will do these things without our help, and not necessarily to our liking.'"

A number of other questions may be raised in discussing the faculty role in coordination, Lieberman said, listing some of them: What are the implications of collective bargaining for coordination? Will the labor-management model mean that policy-making will be delineated as an administrative prerogative, and how can this be avoided? Will interinstitutional coordination lead to greater adherence to the standards of academic freedom by providing statewide support for faculties at institutions where practices leave something to be desired? If we opt for some kind of statewide representative faculty body, what should be its composition, its powers, its functions, its relations to its constituents? How can individual institutions develop and meet objectives to complement those of other institutions, and minimize wasteful interinstitutional competition? Who will pay for statewide faculty coordination? What are the costs involved? And of course, how will the faculty role be affected by changes in the role of students?

Given the growing complexity of the organizational systems within which more and more faculty work, Lieberman said, the question might be raised: "Can a reasonably functioning statewide faculty structure or effective faculty process be developed?"

"The answer to that question is the same as the answer to the question, 'Is government of the people possible?' 'I don't know, but it's worth trying.'"

"I am convinced of the inherent power of the faculty," Lieberman said, "but this power must be recognized and exercised. There's an old Arab proverb that says, 'All mankind is divided into three classes—those who are immovable, those who are movable, and those who move.'

"We cannot expect others to provide a ready-made structure, to refine the alternatives, to inaugurate real communication," he said. "We must accept considerable responsibility in these matters ourselves. This will not be easy, and it will not always be pleasant. But then I guess that's the 'curse' of the democratic system."

He concluded by quoting an eighteenth-century American contrasting democratic and non-democratic forms of government. "Monarchy," he said, "is like a splendid ship with all sails set—it moves majestically on and then it hits a rock and sinks forever. Democracy is like a raft—it never sinks, but damn it, your feet are always in the water."

'It's not going to be laid out for you'

Discussing postsecondary coordination in the context of statewide efforts at overall coordination of services, a three-member panel warned of increased competition among state services for limited resources, and echoed the call for faculty involvement in postsecondary coordination.

Charged with the task of coordinating planning efforts for the delivery of human services in the state is the Minnesota State Planning Agency, responsibilities of which were outlined briefly by staff member Dean Honetschlager. Instituted to manage federal housing funds and other monies coming into the state, the agency gradually was assigned additional duties and now coordinates planning efforts of state agencies involved in such areas as health services, environment, transportation, human resources, and education.

Honetschlager cited a number of coordination activities which bear on education, such as the agency's studies of population growth and migration patterns in the state, and the agency's new function as clearinghouse for grants awarded by the federal government through various state agencies.

A developing activity for which the State Planning Agency is responsible, and which Honetschlager suggested may have implications for postsecondary education, is the establishment of regional planning commissions throughout the state. These commissions, made up of representatives of various elected bodies in each region (county commissioners, school board members, municipal officials, etc.), "help set priorities for the planning process, so that when state resources are allocated, the people have some input into that process," Honetschlager said.

Although the commissions are not involved in planning for postsecondary education, he said, "It is hard to imagine that when they get going and have the capability they won't want to look at all resources of the region and see how they can bring

them to bear on the needs of the region." At that point, regional planning commissions may well ask the educational institutions in the region to be of assistance, he suggested, adding that it could be in the institutions' own best interests to cooperate.

Carl Kroening, a member of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission and another panel member, stressed that understanding of the problems created by the resource squeeze is essential in order to contribute effectively to coordination. He recommended the recent Carnegie Commission report, *More Effective Use of Resources*[1], a quote from which, he said, sums up what he sees as the crux of the current situation: "Higher education must work both sides of the equation—more money and more effective use of it. It should obtain the money it really needs, and maximize the output from this money."

Kroening offered the opinion that although faculties have much to contribute to statewide coordination, it is unlikely that they will have a role in the decision-making process unless they take the initiative to develop such a role for themselves.

The third panelist was Gene Mammenga, Bemidji State College faculty member and state senator defeated in the September primary in his bid for reelection. Mammenga blamed his defeat at least in part on his association with higher education as a faculty member and a sympathetic legislator. He spoke of voters' unwillingness to commit any more funds to education, and the inevitable effect of voter attitudes on legislators.

"My message to you is don't take anything for granted," he said. "The old battles have to be fought and won again and again. Money for higher education is going to be very hard to come by. To win an election this time, a legislator will have to accept the concept of zero budget growth."

If faculties want more money from the legislature for education, Mammenga said, they will have to develop political power. "You will have to support legislators who will be favorable to you, help them get elected. I see it as a very hard-nosed operation. The faculty has to get politically oriented." If this does not happen, he said, legislators' hands will be tied by voters who take a dim view of increased spending for postsecondary education.

In response to a question, Mammenga said most legislators favor the Higher Education Coordinating Commission and the sort of coordination it represents. "Conservatives and liberals alike believe there has to be some rationale to the number of offerings made in higher education. We saw the handwriting on the wall that said we couldn't provide as much money to higher education as we wanted to, and we wanted to do the best that can be done with the money we have. The expectation is that through better coordination we can do better with essentially the same resources."

HECC's relationship with faculties, a recurring topic of conversation during the conference, was the subject of several questions directed at Kroening. He reiterated Richard Hawk's statement that the commission sees its proper role as communicating directly only with heads of systems, and through systems with institutions. Although the commission agrees that faculties should be informed of developments in statewide coordination, he said, it has not undertaken to provide such information directly to faculties.

In the ensuing exchange, Kroening repeated his admonition that faculties should not wait for other groups, such as the HECC, to determine their role in statewide coordination. "The '70's are not at all like the '60's," he said, "and the adjustment process is going to go on. You'll have to have some way to participate in the decision-making process. It's not going to be laid out for you. The HECC won't come down with a statewide coordinating plan for faculty.

"You have the responsibility," he continued, "to act with your own faculty to think about these new times and what you can do about them. . . .Whether you want to form still another group to coordinate outside of that faculty is up to you. . . .But the only alternative to getting involved, as I see it, is to take what comes your way, and I don't think in all cases you'll want to be satisfied with that."

'Postsecondary empire is not going to grow'

"They'll make us an offer we can't refuse," warned Duane Scribner in the title of the final presentation of the conference, emphasizing that "if faculties don't suggest the alternatives" for meeting educational needs within existing resources, "someone else will."

Scribner noted that he had come to speak not as a representative of the governor but as an individual with experience both as a faculty member and in governance of education. His experiences since "crossing over the line" from the faculty role into government have led to his evaluation that higher education is "in a mess," he said. Among the factors Scribner identified as contributing to that "mess" are:

- *Pride in program.* The source of this problem, he said, is an attitude which faculties share with

[1]Carnegie Commission. *The More Effective Use of Resources.* Hightstown, N.J.: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

others who deliver services. "Like the physician, the faculty member uses the available techniques to do the job as well as he can. Like the physician, his main interest is not cost but service. To many people in education it is almost as great a sacrilege to ask about costs as it is to ask in a hospital whether a heroic effort is worth it to save someone's life."

In the last biennium, Scribner noted, the State of Minnesota provided a half-billion dollars in public aid to elementary and secondary education and another half-billion dollars to postsecondary education, out of a total state budget of 2.8 billion dollars. "It seems not only legitimate but necessary and urgent that those who are responsible for raising those funds and who are held accountable for the spending of them begin to take a look at what a billion dollars—one-third of the state's budget—is used for." Given this growing need to scrutinize expenditures, Scribner said, educators must ask themselves, "Are we really pricing ourselves out of business?"

He noted that the various state education systems are not only competing with each other for state funds, but are now competing with other services needed by the state. "Ten years ago, higher education would not have had to compete with sewers for funding in the State of Minnesota," he said. Now, sewers are just one example of burgeoning needs drawing on state resources. Educators, he said, must face facts: "There's no more money, folks; we've come to the end."

- *Pride in institution.* Scribner noted that educators frequently praise their institution or system by referring to its "uniqueness." "What is uniqueness?" he demanded. "Is it results? Can it be described in output terms, as something that happens between students and teachers? Or is it a kind of faculty or institutional self-indulgence, a preservation of empires?" Could it be, he asked, that faculties defend an institution or system because they enjoy working in its environment rather than because it effectively serves student needs?

- *Faculty governance process.* "You have been asking various speakers, and will probably ask me," Scribner said, "'How can we possibly organize to have faculty input into postsecondary education?' You're the faculty. I don't know what I could tell you (although I will make some suggestions) that would be superior to what you could suggest yourselves, if you really want to get into that process." Faculties which are seriously interested in participating in statewide coordination must be ready to set aside their own interests and look at things from an overall, statewide perspective, Scribner said, and most faculty members are not ready to address the task.

"I see the main business of faculties in practice as defending their positions," he charged. "I see that influence at work on their administrators." Instead of lauding administrators for efforts to meet educational needs within a given set of resources, faculties make "relentless demands on institutional leaders to increase the institution's share of dollars, or, in our present circumstances, not to let any faculty go even if the students are no longer coming." He said such pressure by faculties has contributed to a loss of credibility by the heads of state educational systems, who, he said, "are not perceived by the decision-makers as educational statesmen but as advocates for the particular systems they represent.

"With the present set of attitudes, what college administrator will receive the adulation of his faculty for a great contribution to improved, productivity-oriented coordination of postsecondary education in Minnesota? In these bastions of rational thought we call postsecondary education institutions, who is rewarded for development of a rationale to produce a rational, productive system? Our system is a medieval collection of fiefdoms where the lords keep the loyalty of their constituency by doing battle with their neighbors. Faculties are presently part of the problem, not of the solution.

"Can anyone here visualize a world in which your institution or your system accepts a no-growth or reduced role position and works to refine the proper place of that institution within that role?" he asked. "And I mean by looking within departments and programs; not English faculty saying lop off the math department or vice versa, but English faculty looking at English programs, math people looking at math programs.

"The postsecondary empire, in terms of the proportion of public funds devoted to it, is simply not going to grow. The money will go up, but proportionally it's not going to grow. There are other major demands, and there are not other major monies."

Faculty participation in statewide postsecondary education coordination requires a reorientation of values on the part of faculty, Scribner said.

"First, it requires a perspective that is broader than the department within the institution, broader than the institution within the system, broader than the system within the collection of systems that make up postsecondary education in Minnesota. I do not ask that it be broader than higher education itself, although that would be desirable. But there are still too few faculty who communicate a sense of understanding of the total mission of postsecondary education in the state to their administrators, the public, or even each other.

"Second, it requires a commitment to leadership

(a) to broaden the perspective of fellow faculty members, and (b) in the councils that will determine the total thrust of postsecondary education in the state—HECC, the legislature, the lay boards governing all postsecondary institutions in the state, and all subject matter and professional associations in the state."

This means taking some necessary risks of being perceived as disloyal to the department, institution, profession, or colleagues, he noted.

Scribner termed faculties the "greatest resource for making judgments" about postsecondary education, since they are the people "who know, or should know, the effects on the consumers of the services they provide, better than any other resource including the consumer." However, he noted, the consumers of education are doing a better job of seeking input into the governing boards, the legislative process, the governor's office—into the decision-making process in general—than faculties are. But by the short-term nature of their association with postsecondary education, students cannot make as effective a contribution to coordination as can faculty, he said. "The long-range implications of working within resources can only be understood by those who link the resources to the students, and that is not the chancellors, the administrators, the deans. . . .it is the faculties."

"The choice is whether faculty members will commit themselves to input into what the people decide to make of postsecondary education in the State of Minnesota," he concluded. "Will we enter these negotiations? Will we bring our faculty skills and knowledge to bear on those results? If not, the results will be less satisfactory for the profession, and, no doubt, for the consumer, when they 'make us an offer we can't refuse.'"

Participants discuss coordination aspects

In addition to hearing and asking questions of the speakers, participants in the conference took part in a variety of small-group discussion sessions focusing on various aspects of statewide coordination: cooperative projects in professional development for faculty, cooperative projects in undergraduate teaching, computer services, educational media and library services, non-traditional education, problems of institutional compatibility, and the Higher Education Coordinating Commission program review procedure. In addition, one discussion period was devoted to meetings organized according to academic discipline.

The conference was planned and conducted by the Minnesota Intercollegiate Faculty Conference on Undergraduate Instruction (MIFC), sponsored by the Association of Minnesota Colleges, Interfaculty Organization of Minnesota State Colleges, Minnesota Conference of the American Association of University Professors, Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association, and University of Minnesota Senate. A seventh annual conference is planned for fall, 1973.

comment

Center for Educational Development
317 Walter Library
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455